



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

Xer

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,155	03/01/2004	Amon Lavie	02-134-D	3822
7590	07/19/2006			EXAMINER
Jason J. Derry				YAO, LEI
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP				
300 S. Wacker Drive			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Chicago, IL 60606			1642	

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/791,155	LAVIE ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Lei Yao, Ph.D.	1642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2006.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1,6,8 and 69 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1,6,8 and 69 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) 7 is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.  
\_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

The request filed on 5/2/06 for a Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on Application No. 10791155 is acceptable, and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Claims 2-5, 9-68 and 70-169 are cancelled. Claims 1, 6-8 and 69 are pending and examined on the merits.

**Previous final Office Action dated 2/28/06**

The rejections in the previous Office action, dated **2/28/06**, including rejections of claims 1, 4-8, 11-12, and 69 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are withdrawn in view of amendment to and cancellation of the claims. **If any rejection/objection is maintained, it will be stated again below.**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

**Drawn to written description:**

Claims 1, 6, 8, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In the instant case, the claims are inclusive of a genus of antibody-conjugated enzyme comprising deoxycytidine kinase identified SEQ IDNO: 5 conjugated to any antibody, which recognize a cell surface antigen on a tumor cell. However, the written description in this case only set forth one conjugate, modified deoxycytidine kinase (SEQ IDN O:5) conjugated to an monoclonal antibody, HuM195, which binds to CD33 protein primarily expressed on the leukemia blast cells.

The specification discloses that the enzymes conjugated to an antibody, most preferably a monoclonal antibody or an immunologically-specific fragment thereof that is immunologically specific for and thus capable of recognizing cell surface antigen on cells, preferably tumor cells (page 4). However, the written description only reasonable conveys one monoclonal antibody HuM195, which specifically bind to CD33 antigen for treating leukemia (page 83-86, example 2-5, and figure 1). The instant claims encompass significant structural and functional dissimilarity as compared to the conjugate of HuM195-deoxycytidine kinase (SEQ IDNO: 5), which specifically binding to CD33 antigen. Therefore, the conjugate of HuM195-deoxycytidine kinase (SEQ IDNO: 5) does not represent the claimed genus because the genus includes antibodies, which differ widely in structural and functional attributes from HuM195.

To provide adequate written description and evidence of possession of a claimed genus, the specification must provide sufficient distinguishing identifying characteristics of the genus. The factors to be considered include disclosure of complete or partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics, structure/function correlation, methods of making the claimed product, or any combination thereof. In this case, the only factor present in the claimed conjugate is one antibody HuM195 conjugated to a modified deoxycytidine kinase (SEQ IDNO: 5). A description of a genus may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of species falling within the scope of the genus or by describing structural features common the genus that "constitute a substantial portion of the genus. Although drawn to DNA arts, the finding in University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 119 F.3d 1559, 1568, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997) is relevant to the instant claims. The Federal Circuit addressed "A description of a genus of cDNAs may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of cDNA, defined by nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the genus or of a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus." The Federal Circuit has recently clarified that a DNA molecule can be adequately described without disclosing its complete structure. See Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe Inc., 296 F.3d 1316, 63 USPQ2d 1609 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The Enzo court adopted the standard that the written description requirement can be met by "show[ing] that an invention is complete by disclosure of

Art Unit: 1642

sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics ....i.e., complete or partial structure, other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics. " Id. At 1324, 63 USPQ2d at 1613.

The court has since clarified that this standard applies to compounds other than cDNAs. See University of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co., Inc., \_\_F.3d\_\_, 2004 WL 260813, at \*9 (Fed.Cir.Feb. 13, 2004). The instant specification fails to provide sufficient descriptive information, such as definitive structural or functional features that are common to the genus. That is, the specification provides neither a representative number of antibodies that encompass the genus of conjugate of antibody-deoxycytidine kinase (SEQ IDNO: 5) that recognize a cell surface antigen on the tumor cells, nor does it provide a description of structural features that are common to the antibody binding to a surface antigen on a tumor cell. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, the disclosure of conjugate of HuM195-deoxycytidine kinase (SEQ IDNO: 5) is insufficient to describe the genus. Thus, one of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe and enable the genus as broadly claimed.

*Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed.*" (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116).

As discussed above, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure(s) of the encompassed genus of reagent, and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481 at 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence. Therefore, only the conjugate of HuM195-modified deoxycytidine kinase (SEQ ID NO: 5) but not the full breadth of the claims, meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

### **Claim Objections**

Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 1 and any intervening claims.

### **Conclusion**

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following arts are cited in the Office action dated 9/26/05.

Bagshawe et al., (US Patent, 6299876, 2001), teach that the antibody-enzyme conjugate generate a cytotoxic drug from an inactive precursor at tumor sited, which can prolong action of chemotherapeutic drug or increase the cytotoxicity of the drug (abstract and column 14, line 65-66).

Bagshawe et al., do not teach that the enzyme in the conjugate is wild type or modified deoxycytidine kinase.

Wolfgang et al., teach human deoxycytidine kinase (dCK) and modified dCK. However, Wolfgang et al., do not teach nucleotide of SEQ ID NO: 5.

No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 1642

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lei Yao, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-3112. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-4.30pm Monday to Friday.

Any inquiry of a general nature, matching or file papers or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Kim Downing for Art Unit 1642 whose telephone number is 571-272-0521

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Siew can be reached on 571-272-0787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lei Yao, Ph.D.  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1642

LY



JEFFREY SIEW  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER